metrics can be shown to be valid, relevant, and reliable for assessing hazard and risk, they can be and are incorporated into new and revised OECD test guidelines. In the meantime, nothing prohibits Tweedale or "independent, curious academics" from providing a full study report and all raw data from their studies to regulatory agencies, as is routinely done for GLP studies, especially given that supplying underlying data will likely be a future requirement of journals (see Hanson et al. 2011).

J.W.C. was previously employed by the American Chemistry Council, and his work on this letter was partially supported by the American Chemistry Council. R.A.B. is currently employed by the American Chemistry Council.

James W. Conrad Jr.
Conrad Law & Policy Counsel
Washington, DC
E-mail: jamie@conradcounsel.com

Richard A. Becker
American Chemistry Council
Washington, DC

References

Becker RA, Janus ER, White RD, Kruszewski FH, Brackett RE. 2009. Good Laboratory Practices and safety assessments [Letter]. Environ Health Perspect 117:A482–A483.

Becker RA, Janus ER, White RD, Kruszewski FH, Brackett RE. 2010. Good Laboratory Practices: Becker et al. respond [Letter]. Environ Health Perspect 118:A194–A195.

Bero LA. 1999. Accepting commercial sponsorship. Disclosure helps—but is not a panacea [Editorial]. BMJ 319(7211):653–654.

Bipartisan Policy Center. 2009. Improving the Use of Science in Regulatory Policy. Washington, DC:Bipartisan Policy Center.

Brockway LM, Furcht LT. 2006. Conflicts of interest in biomedical research—the FASEB guidelines. FASEB J 20(14):2435–2438.

European Chemicals Agency. 2009. Guidance in a Nutshell: Registration Data and Dossier Handling. Available: http://guidance.echa.europa.eu/docs/guidance_document/nutshell_guidance_registration_en.pdf [accessed 28 July 2011].

Hanson B, Sugden A, Alberts B. 2011. Making data maximally available [Editorial]. Science 331:649.

National Research Council. 2011. A roadmap for revision. In: Review of the Environmental Protection Agency's Draft IRIS Assessment of Formaldehyde. Washington, DC: National Academies Press, 151–167.

OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development). 2008. Questions & Answers Regarding the OECD Test Guidelines Programme (TGP). Available: http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/52/33/40728679.doc [accessed 28 July 2011].

Tyl RW. 2009. Basic exploratory research versus guideline-compliant studies used for hazard evaluation and risk assessment: bisphenol A as a case study. Environ Health Perspect 117:1644–1651.

U.S. EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency). 1999. Determining the Adequacy of Existing Data. Available: http://www.epa.gov/hpv/pubs/general/datadfin.htm [accessed 28 July 2011].

U.S. EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency). 2011. Harmonized Test Guidelines. Available: http://www.epa.gov/ocspp/pubs/frs/home/guidelin.htm [accessed 14 September 2011].

Errata

In the Abstract of their article "Estimating Water Supply Arsenic Levels in the New England Bladder Cancer Study" [Environ Health Perspect 119:1279–1285 (2011)], Nuckols et al. reported the following results:

> Three methods accounted for 93% of the residential estimates of arsenic concentration: direct measurement of water samples (27%; median, 0.3 μg/L; range, 0.1–11.5), statistical models of water utility measurement data (49%; median, 0.4 μg/L; range, 0.3–3.3), and statistical models of arsenic concentrations in wells using aquifers in New England (17%; median, 1.6 μg/L; range, 0.6–22.4).

The authors have revised the measurements using a more accurate method for calculating the median (weighted by person-years) and for reporting the range (25th–95th percentile) based on the values reported in Table 1 of the article, which are correct. The revised measurements are as follows:

> Three methods accounted for 93% of the residential estimates of arsenic concentration: direct measurement of water samples (27% EY; median weighted by person-years = 0.3 μg/L; 25–95th percentile range: 0.1–20.7 μg/L), statistical models of water utility measurement data (49% EY; weighted median 0.4 μg/L; range, 0.2–3.8 μg/L), and statistical models of arsenic concentrations in wells using aquifers in New England (17% EY; weighted median: 1.7 μg/L; range, 0.5–30.5 μg/L).

The revisions do not change the study's primary results, discussion, or conclusions. Nowhere else in the article is the range in concentration by water supply source summarized by broad source categories.

In the article by Balazs et al. [Environ Health Perspect 119:1272–1278 (2011)], Equation 1 was incorrect. The corrected equation appears below.

$$PEP_h = \sum_{i=1}^{327} \left(X_i \times s_{ih} / S_{it} \right), \quad [1]$$

EHP apologizes for the error.

The November Focus article "Mountaintop Removal Mining: Digging into Community Health Concerns" [Environ Health Perspect 119:A476–A483 (2011)] erroneously stated that mountaintop removal mining is the major form of coal mining in West Virginia and Kentucky. Although mountaintop removal is a major form of coal mining in these states, underground mining still dominates, accounting for 59% of 2009 coal production in both West Virginia and Kentucky, according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration (http://www.eia.gov/cneaf/coal/page/acr/table2.html). *EHP* regrets the error.